

Angular self-localization of impurities rotating in a bosonic bath

Xiang Li,¹ Robert Seiringer,¹ and Mikhail Lemeshko^{1,*}

¹*IST Austria (Institute of Science and Technology Austria), Am Campus 1, 3400 Klosterneuburg, Austria*

The existence of a self-localization transition in the polaron problem has been under an active debate ever since Landau suggested it 83 years ago. Here we reveal the self-localization transition for the rotational analogue of the polaron – the angulon quasiparticle. We show that, unlike for the polarons, self-localization of anglons occurs at finite impurity-bath coupling already at the mean-field level. The transition is accompanied by the spherical-symmetry breaking of the angulon ground state and a discontinuity in the first derivative of the ground-state energy. Moreover, the type of the symmetry breaking is dictated by the symmetry of the microscopic impurity-bath interaction, which leads to a number of distinct self-localized states. The predicted effects can potentially be addressed in experiments on cold molecules trapped in superfluid helium droplets and ultracold quantum gases, as well as on electronic excitations in solids and Bose-Einstein condensates.

In 1933, Landau predicted that electrons moving in solids can undergo a self-localization transition [1]. The latter takes place when the electron-induced distortion of the crystal lattice is strong enough to affect the motion of the electron itself, confining its wavefunction in space. This seminal work led to the concept of the polaron – a quasiparticle composed of a free electron ‘dressed’ by a field of lattice vibrations [2–4]. By now polarons emerged as a key theoretical tool to describe electron transport in condensed matter physics and chemistry [5–8], as well as to understand the behaviour of atomic impurities in ultracold quantum gases [9–21].

While the phenomenon of self-localization attracted attention of several generations of physicists, its existence in various polaron models is still under an active debate. In the early 1950’s, Fröhlich introduced a purely microscopic model describing interaction of a point charge with optical phonons [8, 22]. Several theories predicted the existence of a self-localization transition in Fröhlich polaron [23–27] as well as in related models such as a polaronic exciton [28] and an optical polaron in an external magnetic [29] or Coulomb potential [30]. Later, however, the effect had been proven to be a consequence of the approximations employed rather than an intrinsic property of the polaron Hamiltonian [31–33]. Self-localization has also been predicted for a particle coupled to acoustic phonons and collective excitations in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) [34–49]. Still, recent numerical results reveal a smooth crossover of the BEC-polaron energy between the weakly- and strongly-coupled regimes, suggesting an absence of the self-localization transition [50–54].

In this Letter, we introduce a novel platform to study the self-localization/delocalization transition – that consisting of an impurity with nonzero orbital angular momentum interacting with a bosonic bath. Such a setting can represent e.g. an ultracold alkaline or alkaline-earth dimer immersed into a BEC [55, 56], a chemically relevant polyatomic molecule trapped inside a superfluid helium nanodroplet [57], as well as an electronic excitation in a BEC [58] or a solid [59, 60]. As has recently been demonstrated, in such settings the impurity-

bath interaction leads to formation of quasiparticles of a new kind, the *angulons* – quantum rotors dressed by a many-particle field [61, 62]. While the anglons can be thought of as rotational analogues of polarons, the non-Abelian algebra and discrete energy spectrum associated with quantum rotations makes the angulon physics remarkably different from that of any other impurity problem [61–65]. On the other hand, introducing the anglons allows to substantially simplify problems involving angular momentum exchange between an impurity and a many-particle bath. As an example, the theory furnishes the effective moments of inertia for molecules in superfluid ⁴He in closed form, in good agreement with experiment [66].

In what follows, we develop a strong-coupling angulon theory and reveal the angular self-localization transition, corresponding to the breaking of the spherical symmetry. The transition takes place at a finite impurity-bath coupling strength and is accompanied by a discontinuity in the first derivative of the angulon ground-state energy. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the type of the symmetry breaking depends on the symmetry of the microscopic impurity-atom potential, which results in a number of distinct self-localized states. It is important to note that angulon self-localization takes place in the continuous space of the impurity angles, and is therefore fundamentally different from localization in the Caldeira-Leggett and related models [60, 67].

We start from the angulon Hamiltonian as derived in Ref. [61]:

$$H = B\hat{\mathbf{J}}^2 + \sum_{k\lambda\mu} \omega_k \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu}^+ \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu} + \sum_{k\lambda\mu} U_\lambda(k) \left[Y_{\lambda\mu}^*(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}) \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu}^+ + Y_{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}) \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu} \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\sum_k \equiv \int dk$ and $\hbar \equiv 1$. For simplicity, we consider a linear-rotor impurity whose kinetic energy is given by the first term of Eq. (1), where B is the rotational constant and $\hat{\mathbf{J}}$ is the angular momentum operator. The rotor eigenstates, $|j, m\rangle$, are labeled by the angular momen-

tum, j , and its projection, m , on the laboratory z -axis. While a rigid linear rotor provides a perfect model for rotation of a diatomic molecule, the first term of Eq. (1) is straightforward to extend to more complex polyatomic species or electronic states with nonzero angular momentum [68–70]. The second term of Eq. (1) is the kinetic energy of the bosons with a dispersion relation ω_k . For convenience, the bosonic creation and annihilation operators, $\hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^+$ and $\hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}$, are expressed in the angular momentum basis, $\hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu}^+ = k(2\pi)^{-3/2} \int d\Omega_k \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^+ i^\lambda Y_{\lambda\mu}^*(\Omega_k)$. Here, $k = |\mathbf{k}|$, while λ and μ define the boson angular momentum and its projection onto the laboratory-frame z -axis, see Refs. [61–63] for details. The third term of Eq. (1) describes the impurity-bath interaction which explicitly depends on the impurity orientation in the laboratory frame, as given by the spherical harmonic operators, $Y_{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi})$ [71]. The coupling constants, $U_\lambda(k)$, parametrize the interaction of the impurity with phonons carrying angular momentum λ and linear momentum k . In Ref. [61] analytic expressions for ω_k and $U_\lambda(k)$ were provided for the case of an ultracold molecule rotating inside a weakly-interacting BEC. For more involved cases, such as molecules in superfluid helium or electronic excitations in solids, the corresponding coupling constants can be used as phenomenological parameters. However, as we demonstrate below, the qualitative properties of the self-localization transition do not depend on the momentum dependence of the impurity-bath interaction and are determined solely by its symmetry. Therefore, in what follows we will consider the Hamiltonian (1) from a completely general perspective, without focusing on a particular physical system.

In the regime of strong impurity-bath interactions, the angulon ground state can be described using the product (mean-field) ansatz [1, 72]:

$$|\psi\rangle = |\text{imp}\rangle \otimes |\text{bos}\rangle \quad (2)$$

where $|\text{imp}\rangle$ and $|\text{bos}\rangle$ describe the impurity and the bosonic bath, respectively. By evaluating the expectation value of the Hamiltonian (1) relatively to the state (2), we obtain that the ground state of the bosonic bath is given by:

$$|\text{bos}\rangle = \exp \left[\sum_{k\lambda\mu} \left(\beta_{k\lambda\mu}^{\text{imp}} \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu} - \beta_{k\lambda\mu}^{\text{imp}*} \hat{b}_{k\lambda\mu}^+ \right) \right] |0\rangle \quad (3)$$

where $\beta_{k\lambda\mu}^{\text{imp}} = U_\lambda(k) \langle \text{imp} | Y_{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}) | \text{imp} \rangle / \omega_k$ parametrically depends on the state of the impurity and $|0\rangle$ is the bosonic vacuum.

The corresponding ground-state angulon energy is given by (in units of B):

$$\frac{E}{B} = \langle \text{imp} | \hat{J}^2 | \text{imp} \rangle - \sum_{\lambda\mu} \alpha_\lambda |\langle \text{imp} | Y_{\lambda\mu}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}) | \text{imp} \rangle|^2, \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) Dependence of the impurity ground state energy on the magnitude of the constant impurity-bath coupling strength, $\alpha_{\forall\lambda} = \alpha$, at different values of the cutoff j_{max} . The inset shows the vicinity of the transition point. (b) The case of $j_{\text{max}} = 6$ for various types of the impurity-bath interaction: $\alpha_{\forall\lambda} = \alpha$ (blue solid line); $\{\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_{\neq 1} = 0\}$ (yellow crosses); $\{\alpha_2 = \alpha, \alpha_{\neq 2} = 0\}$ (green dotted line); $\{\alpha_{\text{odd}} = \alpha, \alpha_{\text{even}} = 0\}$ (purple circles); $\{\alpha_{\text{even}} = \alpha, \alpha_{\text{odd}} = 0\}$ (red dashed line); as well as $\alpha_\lambda = \alpha/(1+\lambda)$ (empty triangles). (c) Same as in (b), but for the orientation cosine of the impurity. (d) Same as in (b), but for the alignment cosine of the impurity.

with dimensionless impurity-bath interaction parameter $\alpha_\lambda = \sum_k U_\lambda^2(k) / (\omega_k B)$. From the form of Eq. (4), one can already see that the ground state energy depends

on the momentum distribution of the impurity-bath coupling only through the parameters α_λ .

In what follows, we solve Eq. (4) variationally assuming a general form of the impurity state:

$$|\text{imp}\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{j_{\text{max}}} \sum_{m=-j}^j c_{jm} |jm\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where c_{jm} are the variational parameters obeying a normalization condition, $\sum_{jm} |c_{jm}|^2 \equiv 1$, and j_{max} provides the angular momentum cutoff. In order to simplify the variational calculations, we assume rotational symmetry with respect to the z -axis and therefore restrict the variational space to the $m = 0$ subspace. Such a restriction does not amount to an approximation when the interaction is purely attractive, in the sense that $\sum_{\lambda,\mu} \alpha_\lambda Y_{\lambda,\mu}(\mathbf{\Omega}) Y_{\lambda,\mu}^*(\mathbf{\Omega}')$ is an increasing function of $\mathbf{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}'$ [73]. For all interaction potentials considered here, the restriction to the $m = 0$ subspace does not affect the minimizers.

Let us start by considering the most transparent model with the coupling constants independent of angular momentum, $\alpha_{\forall\lambda} = \alpha$. Fig. 1(a) shows the dependence of the ground state energy on the magnitude of the constant potential, α , for different values of the cutoff j_{max} . We see that the energy possesses a nonanalyticity around a critical value $\alpha_c \sim 6$. The inset of Fig. 1(a) zooms into the vicinity of the non-analyticity point: one can see that it slightly shifts to the left the larger j_{max} is. In the limit of $j_{\text{max}} \rightarrow \infty$, the critical point approaches $\alpha_c \approx 5.85$. In this case, the minimizer for $\alpha < \alpha_c$ corresponds to a spherically-symmetric ground state ($c_j = \delta_{j0}$), while for $\alpha > \alpha_c$ the ground state corresponds to a δ -function in the angular space (all $c_j = j_{\text{max}}^{-1/2}$). This result coincides with the one obtained by solving a corresponding non-linear Schrödinger equation on a two-dimensional plane, where $\alpha \approx 1.86225\pi = 5.85043$ was found to be a critical coupling constant [74]. Since the qualitative behavior of the ground-state energies does not depend on the cutoff, in what follows we focus on the case of $j_{\text{max}} = 6$.

For most systems available in experiment, the impurity-bath interaction is dominated by a few first λ -terms and is usually decaying such that α_λ is negligibly small for $\lambda \gtrsim 5$ [64, 75]. In order to cover experimentally relevant cases and illustrate the fact that the transition is universal, we consider several different types of the impurity-bath interactions. Fig. 1(b) shows the behavior of ground-state energies for the cases of $\{\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_{\neq 1} = 0\}$ (yellow crosses); $\{\alpha_2 = \alpha, \alpha_{\neq 2} = 0\}$ (green dotted line); $\{\alpha_{\text{odd}} = \alpha, \alpha_{\text{even}} = 0\}$ (purple circles); $\{\alpha_{\text{even}} = \alpha, \alpha_{\text{odd}} = 0\}$ (red dashed line); as well as $\alpha_\lambda = \alpha/(1 + \lambda)$ (empty triangles). For comparison, the case of $\alpha_{\forall\lambda} = \alpha$ is shown by the blue solid line. One can see that while the position of the transition point shifts depending on the form of the interaction, the transition still takes place independently of the latter.




FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) ‘Localization diagram’ for the angular ground state, depending on the magnitudes of α_1 and $\text{Ln}(\alpha_2)$ (with other α_λ set to zero). (b) Dependence of the ground-state energy on $\text{Ln}(\alpha_2)$ for $\alpha_1 = 0$ (black solid line) and $\alpha_1 = 1$ (red dashed line). The inset shows the vicinity of the localization transition. (c) Same as in (b), but for the orientation cosine of the impurity. (d) Same as in (b), but for the alignment cosine of the impurity.

In order to get insight into the angular symmetry of the localized impurity, we plot the orientation cosines, $\langle \cos \theta \rangle \equiv \langle \text{imp} | \cos \hat{\theta} | \text{imp} \rangle$, and the alignment cosines, $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle \equiv \langle \text{imp} | \cos^2 \hat{\theta} | \text{imp} \rangle$, in Figs. 1(c) and (d), respectively. One can see that to the left of the transition point, $\langle \cos \theta \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle = 1/3$, which reflects

the spherical symmetry of the ground angulon state, i.e. $c_{jm} = \delta_{j,0}$ in Eq. (5). The transition, on the other hand, is accompanied by an abrupt change in the alignment and/or orientation cosine, which implies the breaking of the impurity spherical symmetry, i.e. angular localization of the angulon. It is important to emphasize that such a symmetry breaking takes place at a finite value of α_c , which is clearly distinct from the case of polarons. There, the same level of approximation – the Landau-Pekar ansatz [8] – results in a localized impurity already at infinitely weak coupling.

While the transition occurs independently of the exact form of the α_λ distribution, different symmetries of the impurity-bath interaction result in different symmetries of the localized states. In particular, the interaction dominated by even λ -terms results in aligned states of definite parity, which are characterized by $\langle \cos \theta \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle > 1/3$, which implies $c_{\text{even}} \neq 0$ and $c_{\text{odd}} = 0$ in Eq. (5). On the other hand, the α_{odd} terms break the parity symmetry, leading to the oriented localized states with both even and odd c_j 's populated. We would like to point out an additional ‘kink’ in $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$ and $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle$ taking place for $\{\alpha_{\text{odd}} = \alpha, \alpha_{\text{even}} = 0\}$ around $\alpha = 10.5$. For the impurity-bath interactions of such a symmetry, the $\Delta j = 1$ transitions between the impurity states are dominant. As a result, in the region of $6 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 10.5$, the impurity is localized mostly in a superposition of the $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ states. Around the kink point, however, the magnitude of c_1 becomes comparable to the one of c_0 , which leads to a substantial population of the $j \geq 2$ state and, consequently, stronger localization. However, this point does not correspond to any additional symmetry breaking as the impurity is localized in the oriented state for $\alpha \gtrsim 6$.

Unlike in polarons, the angulon Hamiltonian can feature competing interactions of different symmetry, which results in a richer localization behavior. In order to illustrate the latter, in Fig. 2(a) we show the ‘localization diagram’ describing the symmetry of the impurity depending on the magnitudes of α_1 and α_2 (with other coupling constants set to zero). While $\alpha_{1,2}$ are the interaction components featured by typical molecule-atom potentials [75], a similar diagram takes place for α_{even} and α_{odd} taken as parameters. The top subpanel illustrates the distribution of the c_j coefficients and the wavefunctions for corresponding states. The blue region corresponds to a delocalized, spherically-symmetric ground state with $c_j = \delta_{j,0}$, the red one corresponds to an aligned impurity state with only even c_j 's populated, while the yellow one – to an oriented state with the population spread over both even and odd c_j 's.

Fig. 2(b) illustrates the dependence of the ground-state energy on α_2 for $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$, while Figs. 2(c) and (d) show the corresponding orientation cosine, $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$, and alignment cosine, $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle$. For the case of $\alpha_1 = 0$, there occurs a localization transition in the vicinity of

$\text{Ln}[\alpha_2] = 3$, which corresponds to a transition from a spherically symmetric to an aligned impurity. As shown in Figs. 2(d), such an isotropic-to-aligned transition is characterized by a sudden change in the alignment cosine, $\langle \cos^2 \theta \rangle$.

At a finite value of $\alpha_1 = 1$, however, the behavior of the system changes. Around $\text{Ln}[\alpha_2] = 3$ there occurs an isotropic-to-oriented transition, accompanied by a sudden change in $\langle \cos \theta \rangle$, see Figs. 2(c). However, once the parity-preserving coupling approaches the value of $\text{Ln}[\alpha_2] \approx 5$, a smooth crossover to the aligned phase occurs. This crossover, marked in Figs. 2(a) by a dash-dotted line, is not accompanied by a change in the derivative of the ground-state energy and therefore does not represent a sharp transition between the states of different symmetry.

In summary, we have studied the delocalization-to-localization transition for a quantum rotor coupled to a bosonic bath. It was shown that, unlike in the polaron problem, the transition from a spherically-symmetric to a localized ground state occurs already at the mean-field level. Furthermore, depending on the symmetry of the interactions, the state can be oriented (broken parity) or aligned (definite parity), making it possible to observe a crossover between the two symmetries in the localized phase.

Among the experimental systems to address the localization transition, the most promising one is given by cold molecules trapped in superfluid helium nanodroplets [57, 66]. There, it is possible to trap slowly rotating molecules featuring highly-anisotropic interactions with helium. Moreover, angulon self-localization can potentially be studied in experiments on Rydberg excitations in BEC's [58], where orbital-angular-momentum-changing collisions between the Rydberg electron and ultracold atoms have already been observed [76].

It is worth noting that here we undertook only the first step in the studies of self-localization of quantum rotors. In order to get more insight into angular self-localization, more sophisticated approaches beyond mean field are to be developed for the angulon problem. Finally, studying an ensemble of interacting quantum rotors in a superfluid might pave the way to studying new phenomena related to quantum glassiness [77] and many-body localization [78].

The work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 694227), and by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project Nr. P 27533-N27.

* mikhail.lemeshko@ist.ac.at

[1] L. D. Landau, Phys. Z. Sowjetunion **3**, 155 (1933).

- [2] S. I. Pekar, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **17**, 868 (1947).
- [3] S. I. Pekar, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **18**, 105 (1948).
- [4] L. Landau and S. I. Pekar, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **18**, 419 (1948).
- [5] J. Appel, in *Solid State Physics*, Vol. 21, edited by H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, and D. Turnbull (Academic, NY, 1968).
- [6] D. Emin, *Polarons* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [7] C. Kuper and G. D. Whitfield, eds., *Polarons and Excitons* (Plenum Press, NY, 1962).
- [8] J. T. Devreese, arXiv:1012.4576 (2015).
- [9] A. P. Chikkatur, A. Görlitz, D. M. Stamper-Kurn, S. Inouye, S. Gupta, and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 483 (2000).
- [10] A. Schirotzek, C.-H. Wu, A. Sommer, and M. W. Zwierlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 230402 (2009).
- [11] S. Palzer, C. Zipkes, C. Sias, and M. Köhl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 150601 (2009).
- [12] C. Kohstall, M. Zaccanti, M. Jag, A. Trenkwalder, P. Massignan, G. M. Bruun, F. Schreck, and R. Grimm, Nature **485**, 615 (2012).
- [13] M. Koschorreck, D. Pertot, E. Vogt, B. Fröhlich, M. Feld, and M. Köhl, Nature **485**, 619 (2012).
- [14] N. Spethmann, F. Kindermann, S. John, C. Weber, D. Meschede, and A. Widera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 235301 (2012).
- [15] T. Fukuhara, A. Kantian, M. Endres, M. Cheneau, P. Schauß, S. Hild, D. Bellem, U. Schollwöck, T. Giamarchi, C. Gross, I. Bloch, and S. Kuhr, Nat. Phys. **9**, 235 (2013).
- [16] R. Scelle, T. Rentrop, A. Trautmann, T. Schuster, and M. K. Oberthaler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 070401 (2013).
- [17] M. Cetina, M. Jag, R. S. Lous, J. T. M. Walraven, R. Grimm, R. S. Christensen, and G. M. Bruun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 135302 (2015).
- [18] P. Massignan, M. Zaccanti, and G. M. Bruun, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 034401 (2014).
- [19] N. B. Jørgensen, L. Wacker, K. T. Skalmstang, M. M. Parish, J. Levinsen, R. S. Christensen, G. M. Bruun, and J. J. Arlt, arXiv:1604.07883.
- [20] M.-G. Hu, M. J. V. de Graaff, D. Kedar, J. P. Corson, E. A. Cornell, and D. S. Jin, arXiv:1605.00729.
- [21] M. Cetina, M. Jag, R. Lous, I. Fritsche, J. Walraven, R. Grimm, J. Levinsen, M. Parish, R. Schmidt, M. Knap, et al., arXiv:1604.07423.
- [22] H. Fröhlich, Advances in Physics **3**, 325 (1954).
- [23] E. P. Gross, Annals of Physics **8**, 78 (1959).
- [24] D. Matz and B. Burkey, Physical Review B **3**, 3487 (1971).
- [25] R. Mañka, Physics Letters A **67**, 311 (1978).
- [26] Y. Lépine et al., physica status solidi (b) **96**, 797 (1979).
- [27] J. Luttinger and C.-Y. Lu, Physical Review B **21**, 4251 (1980).
- [28] A. Sumi, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **43**, 1286 (1977).
- [29] F. Peeters and J. Devreese, physica status solidi (b) **110**, 631 (1982).
- [30] N. Tokuda, H. Shoji, and K. Yoneya, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **14**, 4281 (1981).
- [31] F. Peeters and J. Devreese, physica status solidi (b) **112**, 219 (1982).
- [32] B. Gerlach and H. Löwen, Reviews of Modern Physics **63**, 63 (1991).
- [33] A. S. Mishchenko, N. V. Prokof'ev, A. Sakamoto, and B. V. Svistunov, Physical Review B **62**, 6317 (2000).
- [34] Y. Toyozawa, Progress of Theoretical Physics **26**, 29 (1961).
- [35] A. Sumi and Y. Toyozawa, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **35**, 137 (1973).
- [36] F. Peeters and J. Devreese, Physical Review B **32**, 3515 (1985).
- [37] X. Wang, Modern physics letters B **12**, 775 (1998).
- [38] F. M. Cucchiatti and E. Timmermans, Physical review letters **96**, 210401 (2006).
- [39] R. M. Kalas and D. Blume, Physical Review A **73**, 043608 (2006).
- [40] K. Sacha and E. Timmermans, Physical Review A **73**, 063604 (2006).
- [41] M. Bruderer, W. Bao, and D. Jaksch, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **82**, 30004 (2008).
- [42] J. Tempere, W. Casteels, M. Oberthaler, S. Knoop, E. Timmermans, and J. Devreese, Physical Review B **80**, 184504 (2009).
- [43] D. C. Roberts and S. Rica, Physical review letters **102**, 025301 (2009).
- [44] S. Rica and D. C. Roberts, Physical Review A **80**, 013609 (2009).
- [45] W. Casteels, J. Tempere, and J. Devreese, Physical Review A **86**, 043614 (2012).
- [46] R. Fantoni, Physical Review B **86**, 144304 (2012).
- [47] A. Boudjemâa, Physical Review A **90**, 013628 (2014).
- [48] S. Shadkhoo and R. Bruinsma, Physical review letters **115**, 135305 (2015).
- [49] J. Vlietinck, W. Casteels, K. Van Houcke, J. Tempere, J. Ryckebusch, and J. T. Devreese, New Journal of Physics **17**, 033023 (2015).
- [50] F. Grusdt, Y. Shchadilova, A. Rubtsov, and E. Demler, Scientific reports **5** (2015).
- [51] F. Grusdt and E. Demler, arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.04934 (2015).
- [52] F. Grusdt, Physical Review B **93**, 144302 (2016).
- [53] F. Grusdt and M. Fleischhauer, Physical review letters **116**, 053602 (2016).
- [54] Y. E. Shchadilova, F. Grusdt, A. N. Rubtsov, and E. Demler, Physical Review A **93**, 043606 (2016).
- [55] R. Krems, B. Friedrich, and W. C. Stwalley, *Cold molecules: theory, experiment, applications* (CRC press, 2009).
- [56] D. S. Jin and J. Ye, Chem. Rev. **112**, 4801 (2012).
- [57] J. P. Toennies and A. F. Vilesov, Angewandte Chemie International Edition **43**, 2622 (2004).
- [58] J. B. Balewski, A. T. Krupp, A. Gaj, D. Peter, H. P. Buchler, R. Low, S. Hofferberth, and T. Pfau, Nature **502**, 664 (2013).
- [59] G. D. Mahan, *Many-particle physics*, Physics of solids and liquids (Plenum, New York, NY, 1990).
- [60] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, 4th ed. (World Scientific, 2012).
- [61] R. Schmidt and M. Lemeshko, Physical review letters **114**, 203001 (2015).
- [62] M. Lemeshko and R. Schmidt, "Molecular impurities interacting with a many-particle environment: from ultracold gases to helium nanodroplets," in *Low Energy and Low Temperature Molecular Scattering*, edited by A. Osterwalder and O. Dulieu (RSC, 2016).
- [63] R. Schmidt and M. Lemeshko, Physical Review X **6**, 011012 (2016).
- [64] B. Midya, M. Tomza, R. Schmidt, and M. Lemeshko,

-
- Phys. Rev. A **94**, 041601(R) (2016).
- [65] E. S. Redchenko and M. Lemeshko, Chem. Phys. Chem., in press; arXiv:1609.08161 (2016).
 - [66] M. Lemeshko, arXiv:1610.01604 (2016).
 - [67] A. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 1 (1987).
 - [68] P. F. Bernath, *Spectra of atoms and molecules*, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, 2005).
 - [69] H. Lefebvre-Brion and R. W. Field, *The Spectra and Dynamics of Diatomic Molecules* (Elsevier, New York, 2004).
 - [70] Z. Rudzikas, *Theoretical Atomic Spectroscopy* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
 - [71] D. A. Varshalovich, A. Moskalev, and V. Khersonskii, *Quantum theory of angular momentum* (World Scientific, 1988).
 - [72] S. I. Pekar, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **16**, 335 (1946).
 - [73] A. Baernstein II and B. Taylor, Duke Math. J. **43**, 245 (1976).
 - [74] M. I. Weinstein, Commun. Math. Phys. **87**, 567 (1983).
 - [75] A. Stone, *The Theory of Intermolecular Forces* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
 - [76] M. Schlagmüller, T. C. Liebisch, F. Engel, K. S. Kleinbach, F. Böttcher, U. Hermann, K. M. Westphal, A. Gaj, R. Löw, S. Hofferberth, T. Pfau, J. Pérez-Ríos, and C. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. X **6**, 031020 (2016).
 - [77] J. Ye, S. Sachdev, and N. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 4011 (1993).
 - [78] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Ann. Rev. Cond. Mat. Phys. **6**, 15 (2015).